Pages 1 - 14

NO. CR 19-00489-JST

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable Jon S. Tigar, Judge

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

OLEG TINKOV,

Defendant.

Oakland, California Friday, October 29, 2021

#### TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

#### **APPEARANCES:**

For Plaintiff:

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

1301 Clay Street Oakland, CA 94612

BY: MICHELLE KANE

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

For Defendant:

CLIFFORD CHANCE US LLP 31 West 52nd Street New York, NY 10019

BY: CHRISTOPHER J. MORVILLO, ESQUIRE

IVANA DJAK, ESQUIRE

RAMSEY & EHRLICH LLP 803 Hearst Avenue Berkeley, CA 94710

BY: ISMAIL RAMSEY, ESQUIRE

Reported By: Pamela Batalo-Hebel, CSR No. 3953, RMR, FCRR

Official Reporter

## APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

For Defendant:

MORVILLO ABRAMOWITZ GRAND IASON

ANELLO P.C.

565 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10017

BY: JEREMY TEMKIN, ESQUIRE

Also Present: KYLE POLLACK,
UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICER

## Friday - October 29, 2021

9:36 a.m.

# PROCEEDINGS

---000---

 THE CLERK: Your Honor, now calling CR 19-489, United States vs. Oleq Tinkov.

 If counsel could please state their appearances, for the record, starting with the government.

MS. KANE: Good morning, Your Honor. Michelle Kane for the United States. Also appearing for the United States is Peter Anthony of the Tax Division. I don't think he's been promoted yet, if you see him there. Thank you so much.

MR. MORVILLO: Good morning, Your Honor. Christopher Morvillo for Mr. Tinkov, who is seated beside me here in London. With me on video here for Mr. Tinkov is Ivana Djak, Isie Ramsey, and Jeremy Temkin.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: Good morning, Your Honor.

Kyle Pollak for U.S. Probation.

THE COURT: Very good. Good morning to all of you.

This is a continuation of a sentencing that we started

previously. Let me start by asking Mr. Morvillo whether

Mr. Tinkov consents to proceed by video this morning?

MR. MORVILLO: He does, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We are going to proceed by video. It's in the interests of justice that we do that, for two reasons. The first is that the COVID-19 pandemic is still ongoing and it is

still resulting in hospitalizations and fatalities and it is simply not possible for the Court to conduct the majority of its business in person without unnecessary risk to the parties, their lawyers, the Court, court staff, and the general public.

Also Mr. Tinkov is located in London, as we will discuss in just a moment. He is gravely ill. He is contesting extradition on that basis, and so in its current posture, the Court -- it was unable to conduct this proceeding in person, so for both of those reasons, I find that it's in the interests of justice to proceed by video, and that's what we're going to do.

We did make something of a record last time already about the parties' Plea Agreement and Mr. Tinkov's circumstances.

What I would like to do this morning is give counsel for the Government an opportunity to say anything further that they want -- well, let me back up -- for me to place on the record what materials I reviewed in connection with this morning's hearing so that there is a clear record of those, to give the Government an opportunity to say anything additional that it wants, to give Defense counsel an opportunity to say anything additional they want, to give Mr. Tinkov one last opportunity to address the Court, to determine whether to accept the parties' Plea Agreement pursuant to Rule 11(c)(1)(C), and assuming that I accept the agreement, to then impose sentence.

So first things first. I have reviewed again the Plea Agreement, the Sentencing Memorandum submitted by the

United States, the Sentencing Memorandum more recently submitted by the Defendant, and the modified Presentence Report submitted by Probation that I requested at the last hearing of the case. I'm ready to proceed this morning.

Ms. Kane, would the Government like to say anything further in support of its recommended disposition?

MS. KANE: Thank you, Your Honor.

I would just reiterate that this is an incredibly unique circumstance in this particular case given the characteristics of the Defendant as has been described in the papers submitted to the Court, and that given those unique circumstances, we do urge the Court to accept the Plea Agreement that the parties have proposed.

THE COURT: Very good.

Mr. Morvillo, anything further on behalf of the Defendant?

MR. MORVILLO: Yes, Your Honor. I would like to

speak, if I might.

Mr. Tinkov, first of all, as the Court may be aware, is suffering from Graft-Vs-Host Disease which affects his eyes, and it's hard for him to look at the screen. He's also not feeling particularly well today, and so my understanding is that he would like me to speak on his behalf as well, and so I'm going to do that as well.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. MORVILLO: Thank you, Your Honor.

At the time of the plea a few weeks ago, Your Honor observed that the requested leniency in this case due to Mr. Tinkov's medical condition exceeds the record supporting such requests in all other cases the Court has previously encountered, and I have to say that in my 30 years of practice, I fully share that sentiment. In fact, it is somewhat ironic that I probably have far more to say in connection with this sentencing than any other that I have appeared for in my career, but under circumstances which so clearly speak for themselves, less is probably warranted, and so in that spirit, I will be appropriately brief.

For most people, fighting acute myeloid leukemia would be the greatest challenge of a lifetime and more than many could handle, but as this Court is aware, since February of 2020, Oleg has been facing the charges in this case, and as this Court certainly knows, in any circumstance, confronting an indictment is an extremely difficult and stressful challenge. Indeed, short of a terminal illness, it is one of the most harrowing and stressful experiences that a person can face.

Mr. Tinkov, of course, faced both of these life-altering challenges simultaneously, and, frankly, it's nothing short of a miracle that he is sitting before the Court here today awaiting Your Honor's judgment.

The fact that he is here today tells you more about this man that I have the words to convey, but I will try to

summarize it for you very briefly.

The man that I've gotten to know over the past 18 months or so is perhaps counterintuitively one of the most optimistic people that I have ever met. Throughout this entire horrific period, there has always been a vibrant light of hope that has emanated from Oleg. I think that is very likely the result of the daily conversation that he has with his own mortality that makes him appreciate every day and every moment, to find joy in life's simple pleasures and the quiet time with his loving and supportive family, which is lovingly reflected in the letters before the Court.

Following the plea a few weeks ago, Oleg and I took a walk in a park in London, and I asked him how he felt now that his case was nearing this resolution, and he said something to me that I will never forget. He said that he feels like a bird in a cage who is afraid to fly out even though the door has been opened. And as I reflected on that rather poetic simile, it is apparent to me that in part, it is due to the fact that he's been living in a cage within a cage, and while the door from this case may soon by open, the door to freedom from his cancer is still years away.

Nevertheless, while the end of his battle with cancer is far from over, Oleg lives his life now day to day, one day at a time. I know how relieved he is to be standing here at the conclusion of this epic challenge. He is extremely grateful to

the Government to finally resolve this case as it has and to the Court for its compassionate response to our application for leniency here.

He is also very sorry for the conduct that led to this case, and with that, I would simply implore the Court based on these circumstances to accept the parties' agreement and impose the requested sentence.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Morvillo.

And I gather from your remarks, that although normally I would ask Mr. Tinkov if he wants to allocute, that you have now spoken on his behalf; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I can just say I'm very sorry.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Tinkov.

Well, I am required to first consider the sentencing guidelines and then to consider the factors set forth under Section 3553(a).

I start by agreeing with and adopting the sentencing guidelines calculations set forth in the parties' Plea Agreement. Mr. Tinkov's total adjusted offense level is 29.

According to the modified Presentence Report, the Defendant has no criminal history, and I'm not aware of any other information on that topic, and so I therefore place him in Criminal History Category 1, which produces a guidelines range of between 87 and 109 months.

Pursuant to the Plea Agreement submitted in conformity with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure -- excuse me -- with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11(c)(1)(C), the United States and Defendant are jointly requesting a sentence of time served, a fine of \$250,000, and one year of supervised release to be served outside the United States.

In the Plea Agreement, Mr. Tinkov has also agreed to pay no less than \$506,828,377. This includes 448,009 -- excuse me -- \$448,957,108 in restitution comprised of \$248,525,339 in taxes, statutory interest on that tax, and nearly \$100 million fraud penalty.

He has also agreed to pay tax liabilities, interest, and additional penalties for other years that he acknowledges that he owes.

He has already satisfied his monetary obligations under the Plea Agreement by previously paying prior to this hearing to the United States \$508,954,076.

The Probation Office has not provided a sentencing recommendation. I didn't ask them for one.

I have considered the sentencing guidelines, but I've also considered the factors set forth in Title 18 United States Code Section 3553(a). That statute sets forth several factors that I must consider in determining a just sentence: The nature and circumstances of the offense, and the Defendant's history and characteristics, the purposes of sentencing, the kinds of

sentences available, the guidelines range for sentences, any pertinent policy statements, and the need to avoid unwanted sentencing disparities.

Of particular relevance here are the nature and circumstances of the offense and the Defendant's history and characteristics.

The offense is obviously quite serious. It's a financial crime of extraordinary magnitude. That's the character of the offense itself, but I want to make two findings.

First, I find that the offense was aberrant behavior for this defendant. In light of the magnitude of the crime, that by itself would not be sufficient for the Court not to impose a custodial sentence.

Second, and much more importantly, however, I find that a non-custodial sentence is appropriate in light of the Defendant's grave medical condition. Mr. Tinkov is located in the United Kingdom where he was arrested on February 26th of last year. The United States sought extradition to the United States, which Mr. Tinkov fought on medical grounds and which to this date the United States has not been successful in obtaining.

In late 2019, Mr. Tinkov had been diagnosed with acute myeloid leukemia, which is a form of blood cancer. After a stem cell transplant in late 2020, he developed chronic Graft-Vs-Host Disease, GVHD, which requires that he take

medications that substantially compromise his immune system. His body is essentially fighting with itself.

In July 2021, Mr. Tinkov was examined by experts retained by both Mr. Tinkov and the United Kingdom authorities who were representing the interests of United States law enforcement in the extradition proceeding. Those experts estimated -- excuse me -- those experts concluded that Mr. Tinkov's one- and two-year survival rate was very low. They estimated that Mr. Tinkov has a 30- to 40-percent chance of surviving one year, a 30- to 35-percent chance of surviving two years, and a 10- to 30-percent chance of surviving five years.

They also concluded, including the Crown's expert, that Mr. Tinkov is highly susceptible to life-threatening infections complicated by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which was ongoing at the time of Mr. Tinkov's examination and which continues to be ongoing as of the date of this sentencing.

As of July of this year, the experts agreed that it would be at least one year before it would be medically safe for Mr. Tinkov to travel to the United States for this case and that he might never be able to do so.

In light of these facts, two conclusions emerge. First, in light of the Defendant's medical condition, it is not clear when a contested criminal proceeding in the United States could take place, if it ever could. The parties' proposed Plea Agreement solves that problem. I don't think that

consideration fits neatly within the 3553(a) factors, but it seems appropriate for the Court to consider it in determining whether to accept the Plea Agreement.

Second, even if Mr. Tinkov were within the territorial boundaries of the United States or waived extradition, this Court would not impose a custodial sentence because on the undisputed information that has been made available to the Court, including expert opinions provided by persons retained at least indirectly by the United States, Mr. Tinkov would be more likely than not to die in prison, regardless of the length of a custodial sentence that the Court were to impose. This is without doubt a very serious case, but it does not merit a life sentence.

Accordingly, the Court accepts the parties' Plea Agreement pursuant to Rule 11(c)(1)(C), and I will now impose sentence.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, Mr. Tinkov, it is my judgment that you are hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of time served. That means you've already served your sentence.

You shall be placed on supervised release for a term of one year. Supervision shall occur outside the United States.

While you are on supervised release, you shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime; you shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this Court, except that the mandatory drug testing provision is suspended;

and you shall comply with the following additional conditions, many of which you have already satisfied.

One, you must pay any fine, restitution, and special assessment that is imposed by this judgment.

It is further ordered that you pay the United States a special assessment of \$100.

Payments shall be made to the Clerk of the United States
District Court at an address that the Probation Office can give you.

I further order that you pay the United States a lump sum fine in the amount of \$250,000. The fine payments shall be made to the Clerk of the United States District Court.

I further order that you shall pay restitution to the Internal -- there is a typographical error, I think, in the Probation report. Hold on. Shall pay restitution to the Internal Revenue Service, IRS/RACS, Attention Mail Stop 6261, Restitution, 333 West Pershing Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri, 64108, in the lump sum amount of \$ 448,957,108. The restitution payments shall be made to the Clerk of the United States District Court.

Mr. Tinkov, that concludes the imposition of the Court's sentence. I want to wish you the very best of luck, and I hope you prevail over these diseases.

Does anyone have anything further for the record this morning?

MS. KANE: No, Your Honor. Thank you. Oh, I'm sorry. I do. The United states dismisses the remaining counts of the Indictment. THE COURT: Thank you. The docket shall reflect that dismissal. Mr. Morvillo, anything further on behalf of the Defendant? MR. MORVILLO: No, Your Honor, other than just to express his gratitude again to the Court and to the Government for the way this case was resolved and handled. THE COURT: Very good. Thank you all. MR. MORVILLO: Thank you. MS. KANE: Thank you, Your Honor. (Proceedings adjourned at 9:53 a.m.) 

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Monday, January 3, 2022 DATE: Pamela Batalo Hebel Pamela Batalo Hebel, CSR No. 3593, RMR, FCRR U.S. Court Reporter